THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 10. JANUARY, 1941. Vol. XXX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

'Give it them back.'

When the Prime Minister was inspecting the ruins of the Guildhall and the Wren Churches, the citizens of London greeted him with the cry, 'We can take it all, but give it them back.' Dr. Mervyn Haigh, Bishop of Coventry, in his recent address to his Diocesan Conference maintained that the British Government would be morally justified, if strategic necessity demanded it, in saying to the German Government:

> 'If you go on treating whole cities as legitimate targets, we shall be somewhat less discriminating in bombing yours.'

From this courageous statement the *Church Times* deduced the conclusion that Dr. Haigh

> 'claims that no moral standard can be applied to the testing of new military devices, however abominable.'

This monstrous misrepresentation was justly resented by the Bishop. The distinction between legitimate reprisals and illegitimate reprisals seems to us to be this. We are not justified morally in inflicting reprisals on our enemy simply on the ground that we are entitled to make him suffer as much suffering as he has inflicted on us. If, however, our Government is forced to the conclusion that only by inflicting reprisals on the enemy can the barbarous and illegitimate methods of that enemy's war-

fare be terminated, or even checked, the Government is morally justified—nay, even morally bound—to practise such reprisals for the protection of its own subjects.

Up to the present the Government has taken the view that its war efforts were more effectively used by bombing the military objectives of the enemy than by indulging in such indiscriminate bombing of the civil population as the Germans have practised in their raids over this country. If the Government, in view of recent events, has come to the conclusion that British indiscriminate bombing of Germany would compel the Germans to abandon their wholesale efforts to terrorize our civil population by their indiscriminate bombing, our Government would be morally justified in so acting. Whilst we are clear here about the moral issue, the Government alone can decide the strategic issue.

Yet we may fervently hope that our Government will not be forced to adopt these terrorist methods. Britain has stood before the world as a noble example of humanitarian methods in warfare: chivalry has marked not only our methods in warfare, but also our treatment of the vanquished. Any lowering of these standards, even though it might be to our temporal advantage in fighting against a ruthless and brutal foe, could only be sanctioned with extreme misgiving. We know that this must be the conviction of our Government. Let us hope that some other means of dealing with the menacing disaster of indiscriminate night-bombing by the Germans may be granted to our strategists and technicians.

Dr. Cummins honoured by President Roosevelt.

We are glad to record that one of the most stalwart supporters of the *Modern Churchman* in the U.S.A. (and we have a number of stalwart supporters there), Alexander Griswold Cummins, Editor of the *Chronicle* (Poughkeepsie, New York), has just celebrated the fortieth anniversary of his Rectorate at Christ Church, Poughkeepsie. Among the many personal tributes which professors, bishops, judges and other distinguished persons united in paying to Dr. Cummins was the following telegram from President Roosevelt:

> 'My hearty congratulations on the happy occasion of the fortieth anniversary of your devoted labors as rector of Christ Church. It gives

me real pleasure to join with your parishioners and the legion of your friends in the community in wishing you all the happiness which should be the just reward of two score years in helpful service for God, for country, and your fellow-man.'

Dr. William Starr Myers of Princeton University, in the opening speech of the celebration, described Dr. Cummins as 'clear eyed and unafraid.' That is certainly the impression which his editing of the *Chronicle* has given its readers. It is also the impression which many will have received who have heard Dr. Cummins speak at our annual Modern Churchmen's Conferences. Although he possesses the courage and candour of a Christian prophet, these virtues are not rendered less effective by being combined with a pleasant sense of humour. His presence added not a little to the geniality of our gatherings.

A clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, he regards the Protestant Reformation, like the French Revolution, as one of those great movements in human progress from which humanity has gained much. When attending one of our Oxford Conferences he invited its members to join with him in laying a wreath at the foot of the Martyrs' Memorial in St. Giles'.

The Very Rev. Luther A. Weigle, Dean of Yale University, in tendering his congratulations expressed his 'amazement that Dr. Cummins had been able to carry on his work for forty years and neither he nor his parish have become tired.' Perhaps this may be due to Dr. Cummins having consistently made 'freedom of worship, freedom of the Gospel, and freedom of conscience' the keynote of his ministry. And united to these, we may add, a large-minded, large-hearted freedom of speech. When peace returns we hope that we may again welcome to our conferences the 'Happy Warrior' of American religious controversy.

Pacific Proposals and their Practical Application.

The following letter, published in the *Times* of December 21st under the headings 'Foundations of Peace—A Christian Basis—Agreement among the Churches,' has secured sympathetic support in Church circles:

Sir,—The present evils in the world are due to the failure of nations and peoples to carry out the laws of God. No permanent peace is possible in Europe unless the principles of the Christian religion are

made the foundation of national policy and of all social life. This involves regarding all nations as members of one family under the Fatherhood of God.

We accept the five points of Pope Pius XII as carrying out this principle (see 'The Pope's Five Peace Points,' pp. 13-16):

1. The assurance to all nations of their right to life and independence. The will of one nation to live must never mean the sentence of death passed upon another. When this equality of rights has been destroyed, attacked, or threatened order demands that reparation shall be made, and the measure and extent of that reparation shall be made, not by the sword nor by the arbitrary decision of self-interest, but by the rules of justice and reciprocal equity.

2. This requires that the nations be delivered from the slavery imposed upon them by the race for armaments and from the danger that material force, instead of serving to protect the right, may become an overbearing and tyrannical master. The order thus established requires a mutually agreed organic progressive disarmament, spiritual as well as material, and security for the effective implementing of such an agreement.

3. Some judicial institution which shall guarantee the loyal and faithful fulfilment of conditions agreed upon and which shall in case of recognized need revise and correct them.

4. The real needs and just demands of nations and populations and racial minorities to be adjusted as occasion may require, even where no strictly legal right can be established, and a foundation of mutual confidence to be thus laid, whereby many incentives to violent action will be removed.

5. The development among peoples and their rulers of that sense of deep and keen responsibility which weighs human statutes according to the sacred and inviolable standards of the laws of God. They must hunger and thirst after justice and be guided by that universal love which is the compendium and most general expression of the Christian ideal.

With these basic principles for the ordering of international life we would associate five standards by which economic situations and proposals may be tested (see 'The Churches Survey Their Task,' pp. 116, 117):

1. Extreme inequality in wealth and possessions should be abolished;

2. Every child, regardless of race or class, should have equal opportunities of education, suitable for the development of his peculiar capacities;

3. The family as a social unit must be safeguarded;

4. The sense of a Divine vocation must be restored to man's daily work;

5. The resources of the earth should be used as God's gifts to the whole human race, and used with due consideration for the needs of the present and future generations.

We are confident that the principles which we have enumerated would be accepted by rulers and statesmen throughout the British Commonwealth of Nations and would be regarded as the true basis on which a lasting peace could be established.

COSMO CANTUAR, Archbishop of Canterbury.
A. CARDINAL HINSLEY, Archbishop of Westminster,
WALTER H. ARMSTRONG, Moderator, Free Church Federal Council.
WILLIAM EBOR, Archbishop of York.

This document will perhaps constitute the most important utterance of its kind. It represents the expression of the Christian consciousness in search of remedies for the manifold ills from which a war-torn world is suffering to-day. The literary creators of Christian Utopias and Democratic Erewhons may well make large use of its proposals in depicting the political, economic and social felicities of a world-state which has yet to be realized.

It is difficult to imagine any responsible person in the Christian Church or in the British Empire venturing to contradict any of the ideals presented in this document. For Christian idealists the drawing up of such documents is a comparatively easy task. The securing of signatures to them for publication is more difficult, not because of dissent from the affirmations of the document, but because of hesitation to sign with those from whose views we differ in other matters. But the task becomes easier when of the four signatories to this document two are English Archbishops affirming the pronouncements of a contemporary Pope and the third signatory is himself an English Cardinal. The securing of the fourth signature—the representative of our Free Churches—is a more remarkable achievement. But perhaps he, in this case, may be regarded as representing the responsible British citizen who dare not decline to sign lest he should seem to deny.

Of course the real problem of such a document has yet to be faced—how to implement it. 'There's the rub.' How differently the implementing of this document by Christian leaders will be understood may be imagined from the fact that Pope Pius XII, who is made responsible for the main statements which the document affirms, does not seem to have considered the Italian conquest of Abyssinia as unworthy of the Papal benediction,

and possibly for him the Italian subjugation of Albania falls in the same category.

The real difficulty, then, lies in the application of these general Christian principles, and there is very little reason for believing that agreement in the principles will mean agreement in their practical application. May we venture to select an example of this possible difference in application from an existing situation which touches us nearly? We think it probable that Cardinal Hinsley would favour the surrender of naval bases by the Eire Government to secure the protection of our sea-borne traffic in the Western Atlantic: but we think it equally probable that the Roman Hierarchy of Eire would not be in agreement with the English Cardinal on this point.

In conclusion, may we emphasize that so far as the British Commonwealth of Nations is concerned our legislators and administrators for more than fifty years past have been seeking, and not unsuccessfully, in many spheres and by many methods to implement practically those great Christian principles which are enunciated in this important ecclesiastical pronouncement.

The Prospects of English Institutional Religion.

The figures published in the latest edition of the *Official Year Book of the Church of England*[1] are not cheering. In the numbers of Baptisms, Confirmations, Sunday School scholars, Sunday School teachers and Easter communicants, decreases are registered. This applies also to the financial contributions to the various church funds.

Our first impulse is to diagnose these decreases as due to the war. This explanation, however, is not sound. These decreases are not a startling exception to what has been happening for some years past. They are merely the last of a series. From them it is clear that institutional religion in this country, so far as the Church of England is concerned, is a declining force. If we enquire why this should be so, we realize that for a single effect—especially so significant and widespread an effect—there must be, and there undoubtedly are, many causes. Profound in-

[1] Press and Publication Board of the Church Assembly, 2 Great Peter Street, Westminster. 7*s*. 6*d*.; by post 8*s*. 1*d*.

sight, combined with an equally rare freedom from prejudice, is needed to estimate these causes rightly. There is, however, no doubt that the failure to provide influential Christian teaching in the primary and secondary schools of this country for at least two generations past, owing to the religious antagonisms and jealousies of Churchmen and Dissenters, is the chief cause. Although the mental misconceptions and evil passions which produced it are happily much weakened, if not entirely dissipated, an effective policy for the securing of such influential Christian education in our primary and secondary schools has not yet been implemented. It is customary to blame the parents for their failure to teach religion to their own children, but as Dr. David, Bishop of Liverpool, has pointed out recently, parents themselves to-day are the victims of this grievous defect in our systems of national education. They cannot teach what they themselves have not been taught, or value that which they themselves have never experienced. This applies also to many of the teachers in our primary and secondary schools. They do not possess the knowledge or the experience necessary for such teaching. Effective Christian teaching is to-day the hardest thing to give. It is infinitely easier to teach any of the ordinary school subjects. This means that the first necessary step is to provide adequate Christian education for the teachers. This, judged by the best educational standards, must be first class. Religious teaching given by the clergy and ministers of religion in their classes and pulpits can be no adequate substitute for the Christian education that ought to be given in all the schools of the nation by their teachers. That Christian education should be essentially truthful and in harmony with our best scientific and historical knowledge and so carry with it the cogency of truth. It also must be essentially practical, having as its goal the formation of the Christian character. Dogmatic differences and denominational loyalties should therefore be outside its scope. So much, in theory at any rate, for the Christian education of the children of the nation.

But what is to be done about the Christian education of our adults? This, it will be said, is pre-eminently the function of the clergy of the Church of England. Undoubtedly. In that case it will be maintained that we must get our adult population

to return to their parish churches. Many clergymen are doing their best here, and their ready serviceableness and courageous enterprise in our war-afflicted centres has given a number of them new opportunities for getting into closer contact with their parishioners. But it may be frankly questioned whether the services which the new converts find in their parish churches will long retain their loyalty. 'There is too much "reading of the minutes" at these meetings to make it worth my while to attend,' an absentee wellwisher remarked to his padre. To render our parish church services both attractive and helpful they have got, somehow, to be transformed in the way in which Dick Sheppard transformed the services in St. Martin's-in-the Fields. This means infinite variety and much experiment, and the cordial granting of the necessary freedom for it. Even then it is more than doubtful whether many of our adults will return. Our English folk are not sacramentalist in their religion. This is overwhelmingly indicated by our church statistics. But the growing sacramentalism of our clergy, increasingly evident in our church services, however much support it may receive from Continental, mediaeval and primitive examples, is ineffective with us.

Yet the Christian situation in this country is not so depressing as church statistics might lead us to suppose. On every hand there is splendid evidence of the Christian character and the Christian spirit in our nation to-day, and among every class—most of them non-church-goers. Where did they get it from? From all kinds of inherited influences operating in their environment. Perhaps there is one of these influences, not inherited but very modern, which should not be left out of account. It is the religious influence of the wireless. The director of religion in the B.B.C. is in his way a more potent religious force in the nation than is the Archbishop of Canterbury. Not a few clergymen have already realized that they have much to learn from the methods of religious services and teaching provided by the wireless, and we suspect that the number of English people who make frequent and regular use of those services far exceeds the number who attend divine worship in our churches and chapels.

THE INSPIRATION OF CHRISTIAN MODERNISM *

By the Rev. C. Knox, S.T.D., Chaplain of Columbia University, U.S.A.

'Remember ye not the former things, neither consider the things of old. Behold, I will do a new thing; now it shall spring forth; shall ye not know it?'—*Isaiah* xliii, 19.

THIS counsel, spoken by the prophet in the name of the Lord, is one of the most arresting pronouncements to be found anywhere in the Bible. To those who heard this advice, it must have seemed strangely to go counter to a long-accepted belief. For had they not been repeatedly told by many teachers that the first requirement of religion was that they should never cease to remember the mighty works of old? Would not this counsel appear to ignore one of the principal values in education? To have accurate knowledge of former events, intelligently to appreciate the outstanding achievements of past generations, does not such ability form an essential part of the equipment for living which education affords?

But it is evident that this prophet, known as the Second Isaiah, was not a man who had a superficial view of the significance of history. In a passage preceding the direction not to consider 'the things of old,' he recalls to mind the deliverance from servitude in Egypt—the most memorable event in the life of the people. And throughout his writing he refers to other signal acts which showed the Divine purpose for them.

A few decades prior to the time of this writing, about the middle of the sixth century before Christ, the nation had suffered a crushing disaster. The land of Palestine had been invaded by the mighty armies of Babylon, and the capital city with surrounding villages laid in ruin. Of the inhabitants who had escaped death large numbers had been deported and were still held in captivity. The people had long looked for the coming of a day of security and peace. But now this calamity seemed to put an end to their hope. There appeared to be no

* A Baccalaureate Sermon.

justice in the world, no power to uphold the right. The taunt of their oppressors was heard, which was also a question that many perplexed persons were asking in their hearts, 'Where is now thy God?'

These were 'the former things' of which the prophet spoke. He well knew the suffering such events had brought, for he was one of the victims. Nevertheless, what he bade his people to do was not so to dwell in their thoughts upon this failure of their hopes that they would be kept from seeing the new thing which it was the purpose of God to bring forth. 'Behold, I will do a new thing; now it shall spring forth: shall ye not know it?' They were to rise to a larger and truer knowledge of God. For He is the Creator, whose power and majestic laws are to be seen in the universe, whose eternal nature it is to produce the new. By bringing their lives into an inner spiritual relationship to Him, there would be released and strengthened in them a like power to create. This was the most important thing for them to consider. Through a true knowledge of God they would come to the unfailing Source of all spiritual renewal; they would have in themselves a fresh creative spirit sufficient to throw off the burden of past failure and to advance to a new height of enduring achievement: 'They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength: they shall mount up with wings as eagles: they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint' (*Isaiah* xl, 31).

Not long after the date of this declaration there did occur an amazing event. Through the rise of a strong and humane leader these deported people, with others, were permitted to return to their own land, to engage in its rebuilding, and a new movement of liberation began. There was then inaugurated one of the great creative epochs in Hebrew religion and culture, which has profoundly affected all subsequent ages including our own.

As you come to the day of your graduation you know acutely the difficult, desperate conditions which have to be met. To a world-wide economic derangement there is the added spectacle of war with its destruction and ravages. These events mean the break-down of the highest hopes and aspirations of men. They make plain men's impotence to realize their ideals. And the failure is due to a wrong remembrance of 'former things,' to a

perpetuation into our present of ideas and practices which should have been forever left behind.

Two decades ago there were men and women who had the vision of a new world of order, of increasing justice and peace. For a brief period it was hoped that all men would not be disobedient to that heavenly vision. But instead of resolutely facing forward to meet the new, they looked back to things of old. And like Lot's wife they became petrified. The outward conditions were ready, but men neglected to cultivate within the necessary spiritual creative energy to make use of them. The house of humanity was prepared for its rightful occupant, but it was left spiritually empty. So the old demon of evil entered in with seven other devils more equipped for destruction than himself, and the last state has become worse than the first.

But with realistic recognition of these old evils, nevertheless, the most important thing for us to discern is the emergence of the new: to hear these same words which are God's message and assurance to us, 'Behold, I will do a new thing; now it shall spring forth; shall ye not know it?' Instead of weakening our thoughts and our actions by an undue, repetitious recital of old evils, shall we not rather so strengthen our mental and spiritual energies within that we actually possess the power to create the new?

The secret by which we can gain this greater creative spiritual power is found as we now rise to a larger and truer knowledge of God, particularly to a knowledge of God and of our relationship to Him as made known in Christ. At the time of Christ, as Dr. Glover of Cambridge has graphically described,[1] the world 'had reached a halting place in its progress.' Men had 'lost faith in reason'; there was 'a loss of nerve' which 'affected character and men's ideals and their sense of the possible.' 'Fixed ideas were ruining the world: its thinking was done by routine, its hopes had fallen, its activities miscarried, it had lost the sense of youth and the morning: it had lost faith.'

Into this weary and disintegrating world Christ came as a liberating personality and force. By bringing men into a new relationship to God, He was a fortifier of their minds and wills.

[1] *The Influence of Christ in the Ancient World.* By T. R. Glover. (Cambridge Press, 1932.)

In place of 'the obsession of failure,' He gave them 'the sense of power.' The message He proclaimed 'introduced a new and liberating principle into society.' He set before men as the goal the new order of the Kingdom of God on earth in which men would know the abundance of life.

So did St. Paul learn of Christ, as the Bringer of the new. 'If any man be in Christ,' he says, 'he is a new creature' (*II Cor.* v, 17). 'This one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ' (*Phil.* iii, 13-14). And the book placed last in the New Testament has as its final word, 'He that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new' (*Rev.* xxi, 5).

In this world of ours, which is haunted by an obsession of failure, hampered by routine thinking, weakened by loss of faith, our deepest need is for the vitalizing knowledge of God made known in Christ.

To have this knowledge of God made manifest in Christ is completely to overcome the false and misleading conception which puts the creative power of God and the capacity of man to create into two separate compartments. It is this erroneous and harmful division which is to-day a most serious handicap in preventing us both from seeing and from doing the work that is ours to perform. In the new thing which it is God's purpose to bring forth we are not to be passive spectators. We are not called upon only to sit still and wait. Rather because God is Creator, and because man is made in His spiritual image or likeness, so does it follow that man realizes his own nature and demonstrates his closest kinship to God by the exercise of a like creative power. In the words of St. Paul we are to be 'co-workers together with Him,' to be wise master-builders, 'rightly dividing the word of truth,' rearing our society upon the eternal foundations that have been laid. In a daring and magnificent conception he speaks of all nature as suffering from incompleteness and corruption, waiting for the appearance of men who, working according to the divine plan, will have share in bringing all nature to perfection, and thus attain to the glorious liberty of the sons of God.

So in this our day there is a new thing which is even now

springing forth, and of which we can know. We can see it unmistakably in the striving of men to advance to a higher standard and manner of life, in the many movements which have as their object to establish a finer order of society, with justice and security assured to all. Once more the spirit of God is moving upon the troubled waters of our time, out of the chaos to create a new world of unity and fellowship. The outward scene is of the dissolution, the catastrophic break-down of the civilization we know. But if we look deeper, and give our devotion to the creative spiritual forces that are working therein, we shall be able to make our age known, not as a time of decline and decay, but of a great Renaissance, in the birth-pangs of which we now are: for

> Each age is a dream that is dying,
> Or one that is coming to birth.

As we seek to align our efforts with these on-going spiritual forces, how new also are the boundless resources, ready at hand for the creative intelligence and determination of men to make use of them! For many centuries a large portion of mankind has suffered from poverty. The poor have been with every generation. As far back as the time of the book of *Deuteronomy* men had before them the ideal, 'There shall be no more poor in the land.' But they did not know how to attain it.

The new and astounding fact is — familiar, yet so novel and revolutionary that we have by no means adjusted our actions to it — that this ideal of abolishing poverty is at last possible of realization. The technique of production, still only in its first stages, could, if properly employed, supply amply a sufficiency for all the physical needs of men. To make these abundant material resources fully and in the right manner available demands constructive intelligence, with which the practices of men, individually and socially, are to correspond. But to do this we must not too fondly remember 'former things'; we must not be restricted by fixed ideas, repeat old slogans; nor can we 'advance backward into the future.' In thought and in deed we must go forth to meet the new.

In this sphere as elsewhere we must learn of Christ. For He taught that material well-being has its rightful place as man's possession, but He emphasized that direction be given it by

spiritual principle, He insisted that the value of life must always be put above pecuniary profit, and He affirmed that as men seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, all other necessary things, being gained and used aright, would be added thereto.

To do away with poverty is one of the urgent, creative tasks to which you can devote your knowledge and trained ability. In whatever profession or occupation you many enter you can make it your constant aim. It will afford unlimited room for individual initiative—the more rugged the better. It will also require skill in co-operative organization. No liberty that has been gained need ever be lost. But liberty will have its larger content and fulfillment.

Again, for bringing forth the new there are the accumulated resources of knowledge and of modern scientific discovery. In a poetic figure of speech the prophet, still speaking in the name of the Lord, says, 'I will even make a way in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert' (*Isaiah* xliii, 19). This symbolic description has now become a visible reality. Highways have been constructed across continents, and rivers channeled to redeem the waste places of the earth. The physical forces in the universe of which man may learn and use are apparently inexhaustible.

But as we tragically know — and this is a fact so plain and so painful that it needs no elaboration — knowledge and the inventions made from it, instead of being used wholly for beneficent ends, can be and are used for bringing more widespread devastation and death.

Because of this perverted and destructive use, the new thing now appearing is, that men of responsibility are coming more clearly to see the imperative necessity for moral purpose. If the enormous forces put into our hands by modern scientific discovery are not to be employed for destroying ourselves, but utilized solely for human benefit, then as knowledge expands there must be a proportionate, steadily cultivated, and intensified loyalty to moral ends; having a validity higher than man or in social convention, by which all men and nations are judged, and in the service of which there is perfect freedom.

With this clearer perception of the necessity for moral purpose, the indispensable place of religion also becomes evident.

Says Dr. Albert Einstein, 'One can have the clearest and most complete knowledge of what *is*, and yet not be able to deduce from that what should be the *goal* of human aspiration. . . . To make clear these fundamental ends and valuations . . . seems to me precisely the most important function which religion has to perform in the social life of man.' And he adds, 'They come into being . . . through the medium of powerful personalities.'

It is through the most powerful personality in history, the personality of Jesus Christ, who presents to us as the supreme goal of human aspiration the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth, that these fundamental ends and valuations are made inspiringly clear. He is the Light of the world, and in His light shall we see light.

A third new factor of incalculable significance is the intense desire on the part of millions of people for world peace. This is the ghastly paradox of our time: in a day when the people in vast numbers want peace, a few mad men, swollen with lust for dominion and conquest, and promulgating the deceptive, pernicious doctrine of the totalitarian state, have brought upon the world the most terrible of wars. But the thing of greatest import for us to realize is, that the insistent longing for international peace and the co-operative endeavour to achieve it is new; it has sprung forth in our time. Whatever the fury of the assaults now made upon it, whatever set-back it may suffer, against it the gates of hell shall not prevail!

Firmly to establish and to make triumphant this new movement in history is the highest, God-given task to which our nation is called. With realistic facing of facts, with clear-visioned wisdom and courage, and with full recognition that of us to whom much has been given much shall be required, we are to determine our course.

Peace cannot be won by a negative attitude; nor will it come simply by holding ourselves aloof. The blessing of Christ was promised not upon those who merely wish for peace, or who praise peace, or who pass resolutions about peace; but upon the peace-*makers*. So we must both act in the present to uphold the principles upon which peace depends, and also plan for the future. We must be prepared at the earliest moment to create new institutions, new forms of world-organization, supported by

a new willingness to sacrifice and to share in a common cause. In the words of Professor Shotwell, 'It is a contest of the future with the past, . . . the test of human capacity to do the thing which we know must yet be done if civilization is to be saved from the ruin inherent in the old system of things.'

The foremost aim of the education and training you have here received is to cultivate and to strengthen in you, each according to his talents, the spirit and the power to create the new:

> To create,
> And live a being more intense.

In spite of many adverse conditions, there is the evidence that even now there is a new thing springing forth, of which you know. There is the clear summons to create a new and a finer world in which to live according to the pattern which we learn from Christ. While utilizing the permanent gains which the past has won, there must be forever discarded 'the former things' that should not be remembered.

For this achievement there are many favourable factors. There are the abundant material resources such as man never before possessed; there is the immense fund of knowledge, with constantly enlarging discovery; and there is the potent demand for that peace which is the fruit of righteousness, which will permit every nation, small and large, securely and freely, to bring its tribute of excellence to the common treasury of mankind.

Most needed is an adequate, realizing, creative spirit in man. This spirit will be released and made strong in you through a knowledge of God as manifest in Christ. By an inner spiritual relationship to Him your own distinctive capacity to create will come to fullest expression. Above all, you will know the reality and the presence of Him by whom all things are made new!

OBSTACLES AND AIDS TO THE SPIRIT

By J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc.

THE title of Jung's famous book, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, is possibly misleading, for there is much ground for asserting that modern man, far from being in search of a soul, is seeking to get rid of his soul, which has become an embarrassment to him — something he does not understand and has no use for.

A soul, if it is anything at all, is something unique and individual, whereas the whole tendency of modern industrial civilization seems to be against the unique and individual and in favour of the universal and general—*i.e.* of the standardized article, whether it be man or commodity. This has been inevitable, because a civilization built as ours is on science is bound to partake in large measure of the characteristics of science, and the unique individual is a thing which science, proceeding as it does by classifying objects, cannot accept. The individual can only be classified by abstracting its individuality. In a word, science necessarily turns individuals into units — unit members of a class. Modern science, like Plato and the mediaeval realists, believes in the reality of universals. It is not nominalist, believing in the reality of individuals.

All this has its bearing upon the question of the soul. The idea of a soul as a unique creation is not so much false from the point of view of science as unthinkable. Science does not do its thinking in terms of unique entities; if it did, it would never get anywhere; it would be like a man using addition in place of the multiplication table. It cannot afford to wade through the impenetrable jungle of fact; it has to cut a pathway by generalizing. Thus it is not only that modern man is a materialist (or the equivalent of one), and so bound to regard a spiritual entity such as a soul as a superstition, an equally significant feature of his mentality is that he does not do his systematic thinking in terms of unique objects, but of units, numbers and masses.

In Dr. Hermann Rauschning's enlightening book, *Hitler Speaks*, the Fuehrer's anticipations with regard to religion are

given. These are worth attention because, though Hitler may not understand religion, he does know something about the other factor in the situation, *i.e.* modern mass man.

> 'The religions are all alike, no matter what they call themselves. They have no future — certainly none for the Germans. . . . Do you really believe the masses will ever be Christian again, Nonsense! Never again.'

It is quite true that the masses will never be Christian again — so long as they remain masses. They will have to become individuals again first, for the condition of mass man, unit man, is not compatible with Christian belief or practice. Christianity is committed to the view that each man is an individual soul of supreme value to the Creator for his own sake. When this view has been displaced in favour of current ant-hill theories, reverence for the individual is bound to disappear. Indeed all reverence disappears, because it is felt for the individual person or thing — the saint, the hero, or the unique statue, building, poem. You cannot reverence a crowd; you can only fear it or despise it. Perhaps you feel swallowed up or elated by being a member of it; but that is not reverence. The crowd is then only an extension of the self, and to worship that would be pathological.

The first step, then, towards any genuine and fruitful revival of religious activity would be the reinstatement of the individual as a unique being. Against this consummation nearly all modern activities are leagued — science, industry, politics, journalism, amusements, even education itself, which is becoming more standardized as it becomes more mechanically efficient. With regret it may also be observed that much official religion acts in this warfare against the individual as a kind of fifth column, preaching conformity, submission, sameness, and loyalty to the ecclesiastical machine. The reinstatement of the individual as envisaged here need not mean chaos in public life and self-indulgence and indiscipline in private life. The machine economy which reduces men to the status of units or cogs is no enemy of such things; if it shuts them out by the front door, it allows them in by the back. Nowhere is 'graft' of all kinds so supreme as where a hierarchy of officials holds sway, and nowhere is self-indulgence so rife as where machines pour out commodities and give men leisure which, not being individuals,

they do not know how to use, for how can a man enjoy anything when his individual powers and tastes have been smothered?

As to how the individual can be reinstated, that is a problem indeed, and includes elements economic, cultural, political, psychological. This slavery of body, mind and spirit under which modern populations suffer, even when they consider themselves free, has come upon us gradually, and a disease of slow onset is capable generally of only a slow cure. To reinstate the individual would involve putting practically the whole of modern mechanical civilization into reverse gear, reorganizing our education, our economic and industrial systems, and changing our values. A gigantic task. Yet a civilization is a man-made article, and what man has made man can unmake or alter. And in any case there is the obvious point to note, that our civilization is at present engaged in destroying itself, so we are bound to have drastic changes, whether we wish for them or not. As a matter of fact, history teaches that changes have come, not through planning by intelligentsia and idealists, but because circumstances have rendered them inevitable and compelled them when the time was ripe. The physicists now teach that things are really events, and time is a fourth dimension just as integral to their being as the other three dimensions. The historians might well follow their example and say that events do not happen so much in time, as are brought about by time. When the time has arrived, things happen, and nothing can prevent them. Possibly we have now arrived at such a critical moment and we need be surprised at nothing; not even at the individual coming into his own again. So perhaps it is a mistake to plan for it; we ought rather to wait for it, and seize our chance when it comes.

In the early history of the race the selfconscious individual somehow emerged, when the time was ripe, from the co-conscious, tribe, the members of which were hardly aware of their own individual existence. This change is mythically pictured in the story of Adam's expulsion from Paradise, for conscious individual responsibility is a heavy burden after the blessed unconscious automatism of tribal life. But if a change like this happened once, may it not happen again?

A further feature of modern life which makes it indifferent to religious activity is that it is so largely externalized. It is upon

the outer world that our attention is focussed. How could it be otherwise when this is the only world that we regard as truly real? In former epochs even the ordinary man whose energies were wholly engaged in struggling with his material environment, had a lively belief in the existence of the unseen, *i.e.* of another kind of reality to that which he was ordinarily aware of through his five senses. His apprehension of this unseen world may not have been very delicate, and he may have pictured it with a naïve and childlike imagination, but the point is that it was for him a real world, and he did not doubt its power to influence his fortunes.

It would be a mistake, however, to identify belief in the reality of the unseen with a belief in a world of ghosts, gods, angels, and demons, which is only one of several possible forms that such a belief may take. To believe in your own existence as a person is to believe in an unseen world; as also is the belief that the whole of reality has an 'inner' aspect just as it has an 'outer,' the former being accessible to us by a kind of 'direct' perception, as the latter is to our five senses. This 'direct' perception is at present either undeveloped or atrophied in most of us; the conditions of the time are against its exercise. We are so wholly engaged in controlling the outer world, and in exploiting it, that the resources of the inner world are largely unexplored. Indeed, the same factors which militate against the individual also militate against the perception of the unseen. One factor in particular makes any 'inner' experience almost impossible, and that is the speed and rush of modern mechanized life. We never give the dust time to settle, and dust makes for bad visibility. The truth is that the problem of how to stimulate a revival of religious activity is a problem of inducing people to change their habits rather than their beliefs; though a belief is nothing but a peculiarly intractable habit of thinking along a particular track. And the track *must* be a rational one.

Another feature of modern life hostile to religion is that there is a weakening of the motives which formerly used to turn a man towards it. The mechanizing and speeding up of life may at present lead to strain, but if only the mechanizing of things can go far enough, no one any longer will have personal problems or struggles, for everything will be ordered and arranged. A man will only have to do what he is told and be free from all

responsibility. A man does not need to struggle when he has become an automaton; everything is prescribed, and his movements become mechanical. He tends to lapse into the blessed unconsciousness of ants or bees, whose every movement is guided by infallible instinct. The busy bee does not have to think; and even among men busy-ness is an opiate of thought. If the bee began to think, it would not know what to do, and would lose all its efficiency. The whole of modern civilization is a concerted effort to eliminate the need for thought. We have already reached the point when most of our thinking is done for us. Life is thus being lived more and more on the surface.

The happiest men, as well as the most effective, are certainly those whose powers are united, *i.e.* who are 'whole' men, not divided against themselves. A purpose will 'integrate' a man by giving him a centre around which his life can revolve. This is what religion has been able to do for many people who would otherwise have had no cohesion or unity in their lives. Modern mass man does not by any means lack this cohesion and unity, but it is imposed upon him from without by organization; and there is all the difference between the integration which is the result of a personal choice and consistent loyalty thereto, and that which is imposed by order.

Such then are some of the conditions favourable to religious activity: (1) a rebirth of the individual, (2) some diminution of the speed and stress of modern life, (3) the substitution of an 'internal' for an 'external' view of things, (4) some purpose or ideal capable of 'unifying' or 'integrating' individual lives.

But is not this to put the cart before the horse? Are not these the things that religion will give us, rather than the conditions which will give us religion? The truth is that in matters of this kind it is impossible to draw any clear distinction between causes and effects, for the two are inextricably mingled. Any positive activity tends to produce conditions favourable to itself, and it cannot await the provision of such conditions before starting business. But even if this is so, it certainly is an advantage to know what are the conditions favourable to religious activity. We at least do learn something of the obstacles which stand in the way of any revival of religion, and are less likely either to simplify or underestimate them.

A common simplification is to assert that the difficulties are

wholly intellectual, but these are not the most serious, and in any case would not affect the practice of a rational religion which had divested itself of any doctrines that were intellectually untenable. As a matter of fact religious practice can well be begun with a very modest equipment of doctrine. If experience follows practice, doctrine may follow experience. Far more serious than any intellectual difficulties are some of the tendencies in modern life which have been indicated earlier in this article — the suppression of the individual, the mechanization of life, the 'external' view (a matter of habit, not simply of intellectual conviction), and so on. Intellectual difficulties may be the most serious that some people have to cope with, but this is not the case with the majority; hence the apparent futility of 'apologetics.' The majority of people are not in a position to understand the intellectual difficulties; but they are affected by the conditions of their lives, and their habits of thinking, and these are definitely hostile to religion even while their fundamental instincts may be favourable towards it; for man is a religious animal still in spite of the anti-religious civilization he has managed to develop. This is one source of modern man being divided against himself, and being at one and the same time in search of a soul, and of a hiding place to bury it out of sight.

WORSHIP OF JESUS CHRIST

ITS ORIGIN AND SIGNIFICANCE

(SECOND ARTICLE.)

By The Editor.

III.

WHY did the primitive Christian Church, whose members and leaders were strict Jewish monotheists, worship Jesus Christ as well as the God of Israel? In the first place be it observed that in worshipping Jesus Christ the primitive Christians had no thought of departing from monotheism. By their action they enriched their monotheism, but they had no intention of thereby rending the unity of the Godhead — what the later Greek Fathers called its Monarchy (*Monarchia*). All

would have united in St. Paul's confession of faith:

> 'For though there be that are called gods whether in heaven or in earth . . . yet to us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto Him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through Him' (*I Cor.* viii, 5, 6).

Judaism was politically and religiously a theocracy. It possessed two Kings: the celestial Yahweh, the God of Israel, and a terrestrial monarch of the house of David. The relation of these two rulers to each other was that of Father and Son, and the earthly Son acted as the Vice-gerent of His heavenly Father.

At the time when Jesus was born, the Jews had been without a King of the house of David for some hundreds of years. There was, nevertheless, an ardent expectation that a King of the Davidic house would shortly arise as the deliverer of his people — the last and greatest of their sovereigns who would establish a universal and everlasting Divine Kingdom among mankind. This expectation is known as Messianic. The word Messiah means in Hebrew 'anointed,' and was translated by the Greek word Christ. The Jewish kings were called Anointed because the most significant act in their coronation was their being anointed by the High Priest. This act constituted the Messiah Yahweh's Son and Vice-gerent (*cf. Psalm* ii, verse 2, 'Anointed'; verse 7, 'My Son').

It is in the light of this Messianic expectation and its fulfilment by Jesus that His Divine Sonship is to be interpreted. Jesus was of the house of David according to the flesh (so St. Paul asserts in *Romans* i, 3). It is quite true that Jesus was not anointed to be Messiah by the High Priest. He was anointed at His baptism in Jordan by the Holy Spirit. This constituted Him in Christian eyes the Messiah, or God's Son; but the supreme proof of His Messiahship in the eyes of His primitive disciples was His resurrection from the dead (*cf. Romans* i, 4), proved pre-eminently by the Pentecostal gift of the Spirit to believers (*cf. Acts* ii). The primitive Christian Church did not think of Jesus as God absolutely, but worshipped Him as God's spiritual and moral representative, the Vice-gerent of the Kingdom of God destined to come on earth as it is in heaven.

Hellenic Christianity justified the worship of Jesus from a somewhat different angle. It was on the ground that He was the perfect incarnation in human form of the Eternal Divine Logos,

of the same essence or substance as the Divine Being. The Jewish Christian apologetic for the worship of Jesus Christ was mainly historical : the Hellenic Christian apologetic was mainly metaphysical. A modern Christian, if asked to justify his worship of Jesus Christ, would reply : I do not worship Jesus Christ as a god, the second of three gods in a Christian Pantheon, for that to my mind would be a confession of tritheism, which is as impossible as polytheism, since the Christian religion is essentially monotheist. None of our New Testament records show that Jesus Christ ever claimed to be God absolutely. On the one hand, we see Him engaged in worshipping the Divine Father. On the other hand, we see Him claiming to be God's Son in a unique sense, and this as a Christian I believe Him to be. I do not therefore worship Jesus Christ as God absolutely, but I worship the Divine Nature and the Divine Will uniquely and adorably unveiled in His personality, teaching and spirit.

IV.

There is, however, an ambiguity in the word 'worship.' The history of religion, as we have noted, abounds with a vast variety of kinds of religious worship, the human response — as Dr. Otto would affirm — to the realization of the numinous, *mysterium tremendum fascinans*, in our environment. But what is the particular kind of worship which we offer to Jesus Christ? The Reformed Churches have not perhaps given the same attention to the varied meanings of worship which the Church of Rome has done, particularly at the Council of Trent. For Roman Catholic theologians, Christian worship is of three degrees: *latria*, that supreme worship which can lawfully be offered to God alone; *dulia*, that secondary veneration which is given to saints and angels as the servants and friends of God; and then, standing between *latria* and *dulia*, is *hyperdulia*, that higher veneration which Roman Catholics give to the Virgin Mary as the Mother of God (*theotokos*). That this classification of degrees of worship may seem inadequate and artificial to many students of religion to-day we do not doubt, but we are not concerned here and now to criticize that classification. The point we wish to make is that Christian teaching about divine worship to-day would be more convincing and illuminating if its expon-

ents were conscious of and stressed the fact that there are *degrees* in Christian worship.

The essence of religious worship must be the cultivation of right relations in recognition and adoration of the Divine as unveiled to us in our daily life. Such reverence is the salt of the soul, and by the cultivation of it the human being is stimulated to rise to higher levels of living: for 'men grow inly liker that they kneel before.' But what the worshippers must be very sure of is that they really do kneel before the Divine whenever and wherever the Divine is unveiled in their manifold experience, and also that they do not kneel before that which is less than Divine. The Divine must be devotionally that which is above themselves. They must take care also that they do not assign to lower and finite revelations of the Divine that adoration which ought to be given to those higher revelations of the Divine which have greater claims to be worshipped as infinite and eternal. Yet to fail to recognize the Divine and to adore it whenever encountered is to miss something of the fullness of religious experience. It is difficult to practise rightly this worship in Divine degrees since it seems to introduce intellectual and moral restraints into worship, but religious emotion loves, like all emotion, to express itself without restraint.

Moreover, the temptation to pantheism in this graduated worship of the Divine may seem to some to loom large. This pantheistic danger is certainly very real for Orientals, but not for Western peoples. If for the Oriental the danger is pantheism, for the Occidental it is polytheism. Our popular Western Christianity would benefit by an infusion of 'The Higher Pantheism' such as we have in Tennyson's little poem:

> 'Speak to Him, thou, for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet—
> Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.'

Rightly to adore the Divine both in the finitude and in the infinity of our worship is what we need to practise. This will develop an ever-present awareness of the Divine in our environment with a just appreciation of its claims upon our reverence.

If it be asked what is the precise place of the worship of Jesus Christ in this scale of degrees of adoration, perhaps we shall be helped to the right answer by considering concrete historical examples. St. Luke relates in his Gospel that Jesus

Christ prayed when dying on the cross, 'Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit' (xxiii, 46). St. Luke also relates in the *Acts of the Apostles* that the proto-martyr Stephen when dying prayed, 'Lord Jesus receive my spirit' (vii, 59). Jesus had taught His disciples to pray, 'Our Father,' and on the cross He practised what He had taught them to practise. Was St. Stephen wrong in not following Christ's example? No. Stephen had just seen a vision of Jesus standing at the right hand of God as God's Messiah, the supreme unveiling of Deity in human history. Stephen invoked Jesus, not as standing in isolation and absoluteness, but as standing at the right hand of God. It was the relationship of Jesus to God as perceived by Stephen in his vision which justified his prayer. Stephen worshipped Jesus Christ in God, and God in Him. He did not worship Jesus Christ in absoluteness and in isolation. A right understanding of the doctrine of the Divine Being as Unity in Trinity and Trinity in Unity forbids an absolutist and isolated worship of Jesus Christ. We Christians worship Jesus in His relation to the Father, and because He is the supreme unveiling of the Father in our human religious experience. A right understanding of Christian theology teaches men to worship God the Father, not only as unveiled in Nature, but also as uniquely unveiled in and through Jesus Christ.

There is an ancient form of the Triune Doxology, at least as ancient liturgically as the familiar Triune Doxology in our Book of Common Prayer, possessing theologically more support from New Testament teaching, and expressing more justly the Christian mode in the adoration of God. This Doxology runs: *Glory be to the Father through the Son and in the Holy Spirit.* Some of us are no doubt familiar with it as it appears in the Doxology of *O Quanta, Qualia*—the noble Latin hymn of Peter Abelard, perhaps the acutest mind among the great mediaeval Schoolmen:

> Perenni Domino perpes sit gloria,
> Ex quo sunt, per quem sunt, in quo sunt omnia;
> Ex quo sunt, Pater est: per quem sunt, Filius;
> In quo sunt, Patris et Filii Spiritus.
>
> Low before Him with our praises we fall,
> *Of* Whom, and *in* Whom, and *through* Whom are all;
> Of Whom the Father; and through Whom the Son;
> In Whom, the Spirit, blest Three ever One.

There is no danger here of tritheism, such as the use of the familiar Doxology (*Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit*) is liable to develop in the mind of the ordinary Christian worshipper. Were the Church authorities to substitute this venerable Doxology for the one in use in our public worship to-day, they would be helping to rule out tritheism on the one hand and mere absolutist Jesus worship on the other. Isolationist Jesus worship, the Unitarianism of the Second Person of the Trinity, is at least as great a danger to the true ideal of right worship by the Christian Church as is a polytheistic and incredible tritheism. Both these devotional aberrations from the true centrality of Christian Worship, as we have it in the New Testament, orthodox Christianity has always found difficult to restrain. Dr. Prestige, in his *Fathers and Heretics* (Bampton Lectures for 1940), deals in Lecture VIII with the impulse given to this Jesus-Worship promoted by the devotional teaching of St. Bernard of Clairvaux and those whom he influenced, including St. Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Jesuits. He there indicates that this Christo-centric cultus, or 'the cult of the sacred humanity,' to use Dr. Prestige's phrase, 'to the ancient Fathers . . . was a thing unknown,' even as it was absent from the public worship of the Primitive Church. The hymn *Jesu dulcis memoria* ('Jesu, the very thought of Thee'—the Rosy Sequence in the Sarum Gradual, 1527) was composed under the impulse of this devotional movement in the twelfth century. Devotionally it constitutes a striking contrast to *The Shield of St. Patrick* ('I bind unto myself to-day the strong name of the Trinity') composed in the first half of the fifth century.

In this connection it is worth noting that of all the collects prescribed in our English Prayer Book for use at the celebrations of the Eucharist, only three* are directly addressed to the Divine Son, and not one directly to the Holy Spirit. This is because the Eucharist, the central devotional act of the Christian Church, at which these collects are used, is directed supremely to the worship of the Divine Father.

Hence we see that the supreme worship of the Christian

* These three Collects (for the third Sunday in Advent, St. Stephen's Day and the First Sunday in Lent) are not primitive, but were composed in the sixteenth century.

Church is offered, after the example of the Lord's Prayer, to the Divine Father, the Fountain or Source of Godhead. Christian worship is offered to the Divine Son as the Supreme Revealer to mankind of the Divine Nature and the Divine Will. Jesus Christ is not worshipped absolutely as the Eternal Fountain or Source of the Godhead. To offer such absolutist Divine worship to Jesus Christ would conflict with the orthodox Christian doctrine of the subordination of the Son to the Father, such as, for instance, is expressed in St. Paul's *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, that all, even the Son, are finally and eternally subject to the Divine Father:

> 'And when all things shall be subdued unto Him [the Divine Father], then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him . . . that God may be all in all' (*I Cor.* xv, 28).

The word *of* in its threefold occurrence in the Nicene Creed —God *of* God, Light *of* Light, Very God *of* Very God— is gravely misunderstood by many who use that creed. They do not realize that the word here translated 'of' is, in the original Greek of the creed, 'from' or 'out of,' and that it is intended to stress and assert that the Divine Nature of the Son is essentially that of the Divine Father. They think that the creed is here asserting that our Lord is the supreme God, whereas what the phrase asserts is not that Jesus Christ is the Fount of the Godhead, like the Father, but that Jesus Christ derives His essential Divine Nature from the Father who is the Fount of Godhead. Jesus Christ is God from God. He is Light from the Light Eternal. His Nature is truly Divine, originating from the Deity of the Father Himself (*homoousios*).

V.

In a notable passage in the Gospels, Jesus says to His disciples, 'Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?' (*Lk.* vi, 46; *cf. Mt.* vii, 21). For Jesus the worship of the Father in spirit and in truth (*Jn.* iv, 23) was not primarily liturgical worship offered ritually and ceremonially in public in the Temple: nor was it mystical worship of God offered in the inner chamber behind the closed door, although we know from the Gospel records how essential and important a part this worship of God claimed in the life and mission of Jesus: for Jesus the

worship of the Father was supremely moral worship, the worship offered by loyal and whole-hearted obedience to the Divine Will. This ideal of worship as moral action was inherited from the great prophets of Israel. The true worship of God was offered by a life of active obedience to the Divine Will shewn forth by active service to God and man. St. James stresses this supreme and essentially Christian ideal of Divine worship in his catholic Epistle, where he writes:

> 'Pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction and to keep himself unspotted from the world' (i, 27).

The word *threskeia*, wrongly translated 'religion' in this passage, is responsible for many English readers failing to perceive what is the supreme character of Christian worship here taught. *Threskeia* means religious worship; and the Christian's religious worship, St. James insists, is the worship offered by the living of our life in right relation to God and in active service to man. 'Pure worship and undefiled before our God and Father'—in contrast to the many idolatrous and impure cults by which primitive Christianity was surrounded—is to visit the fatherless and widow in their affliction and to keep himself unspotted from the world, an echo of the great words of *Micah*:

> 'What doth the Lord thy God require of thee but to do justice, to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God' (vi, 8).

In the light of this ideal of Divine worship, which was the ideal of Jesus Himself, we can see convincingly that the right worship of Jesus is not concerned with fine theological distinctions, nor with precise liturgical exercises, nor even always with mystical communion; but primarily with active obedience in daily life to the Divine Will as unveiled by Jesus Himself. The phrases, intensely reverent and supremely practical, of a Victorian poet, express justly, for many modern educated Englishmen, the faith and worship which Jesus Christ inspired:

> 'Strong Son of God, immortal Love,
> Whom we, that have not seen thy face,
> By faith, and faith alone, embrace,
> Believing where we cannot prove:
>
> Thou seemest human and divine,
> The highest, holiest manhood Thou:
> Our wills are ours, we know not how;
> Our wills are ours, to make them Thine.'

VI.

I conclude this paper with two illustrations. The first comes from Hazlitt's well-known essay in *Winterslow*, 'Of persons one would wish to have seen.' Hazlitt describes with some imaginative licence a long night spent in discussing this theme by the literary circle under the presidency of Charles Lamb. The fascinating enquiry ends thus:

> 'There is only one other person I can ever think of after this,' continued Lamb; but without mentioning a name that once put on a semblance of mortality. 'If Shakespeare was to come into the room, we should all rise up to meet him; but if that person was to come into it, we should all fall down and try to kiss the hem of his garment!'

This story illustrates the intense reverence of the educated Englishman—not necessarily a practising Churchman, nor even a professing Christian—for Jesus; some will say the Jesus of Myth, others the Jesus of Dogma, but we prefer to say the Jesus of History. It is the intensely human personality of Jesus in the Gospels—and not less but more Divine on that account—which secures this reverence.

My other illustration is drawn from modern missionary experience:

> An Indian missionary was engaged in translating, with the help of a Brahmin scholar, the *First Epistle of St. John*. They had come to the first verse of the third chapter: 'Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called children of God.' When the missionary glanced at the scribe's translation, he said, 'Surely you have not translated it rightly.' 'No, Sahib,' the Brahmin answered, 'I have changed it'; and he added, 'Sahib, what the book says cannot possibly be true—children of God—that cannot be true. . . . Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be permitted to kiss His feet.'

This illustration warns us that the true reverence for Jesus Christ is not based on the depreciation of human nature but on its due exaltation. It is only because we are children of God that we are able rightly to worship the unique Son of God, our Elder Brother, as Divine (*cf. Hebrews* ii, 10-12).

To sum up: the right worship of Jesus Christ is not *absolutist*. Could anything be more contrary to the mind of Christ either that He should be worshipped as the Father or in the place of the Father? The most theologically developed of our Gospels, St. John's, regarded as the model of Christological orthodoxy,

which records Thomas as addressing Jesus 'My Lord and my God,' also reports Jesus as saying to Mary Magdalene on the day of His resurrection:

> 'Go unto my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, unto my God and your God' (*John* xx, 17).

BOOK REVIEWS

GILDED AGES*

Mr. Joseph McCabe is a curious instance of double personality: he is capable at times of doing historical work of real value, as witness his *Life of Talleyrand*; he can write an account of his own experiences with a certain detachment and in a style which invites confidence, as he has shown in *Ten Years in a Monastery*. Also, unhappily, he can play the part of the Man with the Muck Rake, as in his *History of the Poper*.

Allowance must, of course, be made for an ex-priest of the Roman Church. It is difficult to persuade a Roman Catholic that anyone who has been a member of his Church can have conscientious reasons for leaving it. We remember to have heard a Roman Catholic chaplain say that no Catholic could honestly turn Protestant; we said that, if he were right, it seemed to follow that the early Christians must have been Protestants. And when a priest secedes, there is a strong disposition to ascribe to him ulterior motives, usually of a discreditable nature. Hence there is a temptation to an ex-priest to become a fanatical enemy of the Church he has left. From Mr. McCabe's earlier writings we had hoped that he had kept this natural tendency in check.

It is regrettable that an author who has made serious contributions to history should write about the Middle Ages as he does:

> 'The literary exaltation of the Age of Chivalry is as regards the character of princes, nobles, knights and ladies founded upon a superstition as gross as the belief in the virtue of a horse-shoe. A summary chapter will be found in my recent *History of the Popes*, and from this the reader may learn that the Age of Chivalry—the period during which the great Gothic Cathedrals were built, the Guilds became powerful, the friars appeared, and wealth and art visited Europe once more—was more deeply and comprehensively corrupt than any other period of normal civilization, and that there is no dispute about this among European authorities' (p. 166).

A great Irishman knew not how to draw up an indictment against a nation; Mr. McCabe can indict a whole civilization before his court of summary jurisdiction and condemn it. When we speak of mediaeval morals we ought to remember that contemporary records of the Middle Ages were generally written by monks, and Sex was apt to inspire monks with holy

* *The Golden Ages of History*. By Joseph McCabe. (Watts, 1940. 10/6.)

horror when it did not have an unholy attraction. Mediaeval writers, moreover, inherited from the rhetoricians of the Latin decadence a strong tendency to hyperbole and scurrility.

Put briefly, the thesis of this volume is that, as St. Simon (not the diarist, but the Socialist) says, *'L'age d'or, qu'une aveugle tradition a placé jusqu'ici dans le passé, est devant nous.'* There never has been a golden age yet, and the least leaden has been the nineteenth century.

> 'Nearly two hundred years ago the French philosophers who did so much to emancipate man's courage as well as his intellect, discovered that there lies before the race an era of unlimited "perfectibility," as they call progress. . . . But the larger knowledge of history which we acquired in the course of the nineteenth century led many writers to oppose this view. . . . The path of humanity is, they say, not a straight and ascending course through time. Progress is cyclic' (Preface).

The notion of historical cycles is a very ancient one, as old as Hesiod and the *Vishnu-purana*. It is a notion not very easy to reconcile with enlightened Christian thought. Christians believe that man has a real choice before him, that humanity is not tied to an Ixion-wheel to revolve at the command of a blind destiny. That the future is inevitable, whatever we do, is the belief of apocalyptic fundamentalists, astrologers, dialectical materialists, and followers of Spengler. Mr. McCabe in opposing this crass fatalism is, however unwillingly, on the side of the angels. But he deviates into diabolism when he denies that the chief factor in the *elevation* of a race is moral and religious earnestness. He seems to think that scepticism and laxity of conduct are the usual concomitants of these bloom periods, as the Germans call them.

We sympathize to a certain extent with our author's protest against the sort of popular historian who wants to turn history into a moral story-book, in which the right side is always victorious. In practice it generally means that the victorious side is right; *les malheureux ont toujours tort.* Preachers and broadcasters keep telling us just now that we are bound to win because our cause is just, a view which revives the belief, condemned by the Church in the thirteenth century, in Ordeal by Battle. Belief in a just God Who is Almighty involves a belief in the ultimate triumph of good, not necessarily in its triumph here and now; or, to put it in a non-religious form, there is something in the nature of things which forbids the final triumph of evil, since evil is always in the long run self-destructive. But right conduct and the knowledge of God are ends in themselves, not means to the attainment of worldly prosperity.

Mr. McCabe gives us a bird's eye view of fifteen gilded ages. Egypt reached a high pitch of prosperity under the voluptuous Amenhotep IV, only to be brought to ruin by the misguided solar monotheist Ikhnaten. The heyday of Babylon was the reign of the enlightened Nebuchadnezzar. Then we are shown India under Chandragupta and Asoka. The latter

prince is generally associated with the rise of Buddhism, but it seems that till Asoka was fifty years of age he enjoyed all the customary pleasures of an Indian prince (including fratricide). The edifying edicts with which he plastered the rocks of India belong to his later and more serious stage, he did not begin to give good advice until he was too old to set a bad example.

There have been only two golden ages in Christian Europe before Victoria, the times of Lorenzo de Medici and *L'Age de Louis Quatorze,* both mostly tinsel in our author's view. Apart from the Arabs, who of course originated European civilization, and the Chinese, for whom he shares the weakness of the eighteenth century *philosophe,* real progress did not begin till the nineteenth century with improved sanitation and free-thought.

It is all rather philistine and bourgeois, but perhaps Mr. McCabe is partly right. *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*; now that they are all dead and gone and their world is in ruins, we may admit that the Victorians were not bad people to live with; perhaps the fifty years before the first World War was a fairly decent time for the average man. It is not very romantic to read about, but when we talk of the glories of the Periclean age, we forget the slaves toiling in the mines of Laurium; when we say that we should like to have lived in the eighteenth century, we fancy ourselves among the fortunate few, and ignore the horrible under-world of which Smollett's novels and Hogarth's pictures give us glimpses.

But the nineteenth century was lucky; the White Man found himself heir to vacant lands, and untapped resources and whole continents of docile natives to exploit. There were limitless opportunities for the settler, endless raw products for the factories. All that is past and over; there will not be another Victorian Age till the wheel has come full circle, and an empty world is there to be exploited by someone else. There is not much sign at present of the coming of the Golden Age; rather it seems, as the Apostle told his converts, that we must pass through much tribulation to enter into the Kingdom of God. And the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

GAMALIEL MILNER.

A CLERICAL ROMANCE*

The lives of men important rather from the office which they held than from their own nature and achievements tend to be dull, and to be avoided by biographers and to be treated for the most part in the general histories of their times. Parker scarcely impressed his contemporaries as an attractive man, and neither his portraits nor his writings are likely to win the

* *Under Four Tudors, being the story of Matthew Parker, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury,* by Edith Weir Perry, with an Introduction by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1940. 12/6.)

admiration of posterity. So that it is not surprising that the last life of Parker appeared in 1908.

Mrs. Perry explains how she came to write about Archbishop Parker:

> 'One day at Lambeth the Archbishop of Canterbury called my attention to the curious fact that so many people appear to be unfamiliar with Archbishop Parker's life, since he was the vital link in the Anglican Church' (p. 7).

This importance may be conceded, but we are scarcely reassured when we come to the present Archbishop's Introduction:

> 'Expert historians may doubtless find some inaccuracies of fact or some mistakes of judgment in these pages. But the appended lists of references and of books consulted will suffice to show considerable research and wide reading on and around the subject.'

However this may be, we doubt whether Mrs. Perry's book will win much esteem in academic circles, although it presents the appearance of a work of academic research. The style verges on that of the historical novel, and a generous recourse is made to conjecture to eke out the meagre facts. The reader will be warned by the recurring 'doubtless' and 'must have been.'

In a sense it is Margaret, his wife, rather than Matthew Parker who is the chief character in the book. Mrs. Perry goes so far as to claim:

> 'I myself have ventured to write of Parker, stressing his human interests, his daily life, his friends; and above all the love of Matthew and Margaret, which may well rank as among the great romantic episodes in history' (p. 10).

The book is largely a polemic against clerical celibacy, and no leniency is shown to those who attempted to enforce it or discourage ecclesiastics from marrying, including Queen Elizabeth. Mrs. Perry admires Parker's constancy in being deprived of his preferments for his wife's sake during the reign of Queen Mary and his insistence on her residence at Lambeth. Both of these actions were in marked contrast with Cranmer's transporting his second wife in a chest and his final packing of her off to her native Germany when things became difficult. Mrs. Perry notes:

> 'After her Grace's exquisite presence was removed, over a hundred years passed before there was another chatelaine, when "the lovely Mrs. Tennison's" name comes down to us with appreciation. In Georgian times there were Archbishops' wives. In Victorian days the Archbishops were all married. The last Lady of Lambeth was the dearly loved Mrs. Davidson, who is affectionately recollected, even as four hundred years ago her visitors remembered that Pattern for Prelates' Wives, Mrs. Parker.'

Mrs. Perry need not have recalled in this brief catalogue the lady who was known as the Archbishopess of Canterbury, and whose Sunday routs were stopped by George III; but she might have inquired why for a century after Parker the Crown appointed only unmarried archbishops. This cannot have been a mere accident or whim. There must have been something un-

satisfactory about Mrs. Cranmer and Mrs. Parker which caused them to be treated as precedents to be ignored.

One curious innovation that failed to develop may be noted. Mrs. Parker was styled Her Grace at Lambeth, but this attempt to approximate the status of a bishop's wife to that of a temporal peeress failed, probably owing to Elizabeth's opposition. A bishop's wife remains plain Mrs., even if she be a Mrs. Proudie, and does not rank with her husband. Even as late as Archbishop Harcourt's time the distinction was carefully kept up. He rode separately in his coach with outriders, while his wife trundled along behind.

A less one-sided account of Parker's marriage would have been useful in view of the modern re-opening of the question of clerical celibacy under Anglo-Catholic influence. Lea's great work on *Sacerdotal Celibacy* was written in the heyday of Victorian domesticity, when the traditional Christian exaltation of celibacy was spurned, but Mrs. Perry noes not notice the change in sentiment, for reasons ranging from the requirements of the mission field to the desire for an ever cheaper clergy. Lea's history ceases as far as this country is concerned at the Reformation, and does not discuss the unrecorded process by which during the eighteenth century clergymen came to be expected to marry, at least when they became beneficed. Rectories were built for large families, and the absence of a wife was regarded as a professional handicap. The movement for clerical marriage began with the clergy and was at first unpopular with the laity, with the result that the clergy had difficulty in finding wives of similar station.

The aim of clerical celibacy is to increase efficiency by diminishing worldly cares and interests, but apparently the average parishioner prefers to forgo this efficiency in his clergyman and to have a married parson who is less likely to be alienated from the preoccupations of lay life. The main objection to clerical celibacy was the impossibility of enforcing complete continence during the turbulence of the Middle Ages. The situation is altered to-day by the stricter discipline prevailing in the Roman Church and the demonstration that it is possible for a large number of men to remain single with few scandals occurring. The choice is not, as Lea would have it, between regular and irregular unions. The distaste for marriage which supervenes upon sophisticated civilizations has produced a number of men and women with no strong desire for posterity from whom a sufficient number of professed celibates may be recruited. P. R. Smythe.

A CHURCH GENUINELY CATHOLIC—OR ANGLO-CATHOLIC?*

Prof. Rogers' book is based on Vincent of Lerin's famous definition of Catholicism, '*Quod Ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus.*' The second

**A Church Genuinely Catholic*, by C. F. Rogers, M.A. pp. 235. S.P.C.K., 6/- net. 1940.

half of the book deals with these *criteria* in turn, whilst the first half is a consideration of Catholicism in the past, under the headings of Jewish, Greek, Roman and English Catholicism. There are five appendices, reprints of articles contributed to periodicals by Prof. Rogers between 1912 and 1934. The book amounts to a justification of what seems to be now a rather dated high-church view of the Church of England. That is to say, that although the author is prepared to allow for comprehensiveness in the Church of England, he emphasises strongly the visible church, under bishops in the Apostolic Succession, and his ideal of worship is weekly non-communicating attendance at Mass. With regard to the former, he is one of those who still claims that the Apostolic Succession can be established as a fact of history. As for the latter, after many sound, if well-worn, words on the necessity of corporate and not individual worship, it is surprising to find non-communicating High Mass held up as an ideal of corporateness on the ground that

> 'the individual is free to do what he likes, to stand, sit or kneel, to go where he likes, to blend his private devotions with the stream of common prayer' (p. 134).

It is even more surprising to find such a service advocated as a remedy for the class nature of the Church of England, to which the author rightly draws attention. Apparently he thinks the Roman church is 'the one truly democratic church in this land, in which class differences do not seem to exist' (!), p. 208. It is odd to find such a position taken with regard to Apostolic Succession after recent work on church history, and in the Oecumenical movement. There is no recognition of the incompleteness of all Orders in a divided church. It is odd, too, to find such advocacy of non-communicating High Mass in view of the liturgical movement in the Roman Church itself, and of recent discussions of the parish communion within Anglicanism.

Prof. Rogers assumes that Vincent of Lerin's formula is a valid guide to the essentials of Christianity: however, his own conclusion on p. 169 is:

> 'Some features of religion seem to be absolutely Catholic and inseparable from the life of the church. Some, on the other hand, are temporal and were specially called out by the circumstances of the ages that saw them appear. These are valid to-day only so far as those circumstances remain or are repeated.'

But how is this related to the *quod semper* of the formula? We are not told.

Protestantism is referred to, only to be dismissed, in occasional short paragraphs, and by it the author appears to mean Calvinism. The tables are turned upon Protestants by accusing them of priestcraft, in that they depend on a man for sermon and extempore prayers, whereas 'if a priest is ministering at the altar or in his stall, his culture or knowledge is a matter indifferent.' But is this entirely a good thing? Moreover, sermons in Protestantism are not supposed to be merely the words of a man, as Prof. Rogers assumes, but the delivery of a Gospel, and, as we have been reminded

in recent years, of the Word of God. Catholicism is praised for satisfying the needs of the natural man, and only at the very end, p. 169, the question is asked, 'Is not human nature fallen? Is a thing right because it is natural?' One short paragraph is not sufficient to answer this question. There is more to be said on the Protestant side than this; in particular, the prophetic element in both classical and liberal Protestantism at their best is ignored.

This book is too slight for the vast themes with which it deals, and consequently it appears scrappy and much of it provincial (especially the sections on the English character). Here and there good sections are to be found, notably one on the Jews, in which the recent work of Dr. J. W. Parkes is fruitfully used, and on Baroque, not Gothic, as the classical expression of Roman Catholicism in architecture. There are also some good *obiter dicta*, e.g. the *rôle* of the church in the Dark Ages is appraised by describing them as times 'when to be conservative was to be progressive,' and again 'insistence on nationality is like refusing to do anything but sing solos to your own accompaniment.' But in other places there are points that cry out for more adequate treatment, as when the high-church party in Anglicanism is credited with *quod semper*, the low-church with *quod ubique* and the broad-church with *quod ab omnibus*. And there are amazing statements, *e.g.* the Greeks are credited with realising that Christianity is an universal religion (what, then, was the point of Paul's struggle?) and Keble is credited with creating the popular hymn (what about Watts and Wesley?).

Perhaps the book's main interest lies in the catholic collection of quotations assembled as a result of a lifetime's reading. Even here, however, there are signs of scrappiness; some occur twice over, and so do some sentences of the main text. It is difficult to know for what public the book was written. It will probably be mainly valued by former pupils of Prof. Rogers.

RONALD PRESTON.

RACE PROBLEMS: ANCIENT AND MODERN*

God's Iron does not at first strike one as dealing with racial problems; but it may be so regarded if we think of it as an answer to the question, 'Was Jeremiah a Quisling?' He insisted that the country and city were doomed and that the king would go into captivity. He recommended immediate and unconditional surrender. In return for his services rendered to the Babylonian cause he was allowed to remain in the land. Do not these facts stamp him as a Quisling? The answer, a very emphatic No, will only be arrived at by a study of the man himself, and that is what George Birming-

* George A. Birmingham, *God's Iron, a Life of the Prophet Jeremiah* (Skeffington, 1939, 7/6); Aubrey Vine, *The Nestorian Churches* (Independent Press, 1937, 6/-); Lootfy Levonian, *Islam and Christianity* (Allen and Unwin, 1940, 6/-); C. F. Andrews, *India and the Pacific* (Allen and Unwin, 1937, 3/6 and 6/-); A. Morgan Young, *The Rise of a Pagan State* (Allen and Unwin, 1939, 7/6).

ham gives us most delightfully. Living in a little nation within earshot of the tramp of great armies, Assyrian, Scythian, Egyptian, Babylonian, the prophet's policy is determined by the word of God Himself, and none but a man of deep piety can hear that word. The Quislings of this world never hear that voice, only the voice of self. The book will make its appeal particularly to those who care for good literature and character delineation.

Dr. Nicholas Zernov, in a service of Christian unity in January, 1940, said that the Orthodox Church was the first to bear the brunt of attack from a totalitarian state. That is only true of the twentieth century. Totalitarianism, apart from the name, is not a modern invention; and its chief characteristic—barbaric tyranny—is old and universal. The best example in earlier times of a Christian Church in a non-Christian totalitarian state is the Assyrian (or Nestorian) Church under the Caliphs. Aubrey Vine's book gives a complete history of the Nestorian Church from its commencement to the present day. They suffered bitter persecution under the Parthians before the rise of Islam. Under the Caliphs it was not exactly persecution which they suffered, but the steady pressure of a non-Christian totalitarian state, a condition of affairs which well repays study from the point of view of racial and religious relations.

Lootfy Levonian has every right to speak of the relationship between Christianity and Islam, for, coming of a race which has every historical reason for hostility to Muslims, he has devoted his life to presenting Christianity to them. In *Islam and Christianity* the difficulty of evangelising Muslims is traced back to the underlying causes, partly historical, but more seriously psychological. In the field of history and in the conflicts between Christian and Muslim, the faults that have caused misunderstanding and hatred have been perhaps fairly evenly divided between the two sides. In the deeper psychological issues the author has shown at length that Islam is materialistic at the core, so much so that the very words for 'spirit,' etc., have a materialistic connotation. This is Islam's loss; but Christians stand to blame for not having discovered it till recent times, so that most Christian propaganda has fallen wide of the mark. What use was it to speak of the Holy Spirit as a Person of the Trinity when 'Holy Spirit' to Muslim ears meant a being created by God, an alias for Gabriel? The lesson is obvious: you must understand your neighbour's mental background before you can live peaceably with him. Much more is it necessary before you can convert him.

India and the Pacific is mainly an account of the racial problems of the Fiji Islands, where Fijians, Indians and Europeans live happily together. Indeed, their relations must be very happy, for even C. F. Andrews, who always had so strong a bias against the British Government, could only find very minor points to criticise. One is glad to see an appreciation of the part that Christianity is playing and will play in their social life. Possibly it may

have been as an offset against this appreciation that he spoke so highly of the benefits of Hindu religion to the Indians in the Fiji Islands. Most observers in India would scarcely regard orthodox Hinduism as a force for social uplift or for the solving of racial antagonisms.

In *The Rise of a Pagan State* A. Morgan Young gives us a carefully compiled account of Japanese history and religion from its earliest records to the present day, showing as clearly as can be the complete absence of any constructive religious ideas or any moral teaching worth the name. Lie has been heaped upon lie to form the Shinto structure, culminating in the meaningless boast of the divinity of the Emperor, a gigantic fraud on which Japan's aggressive patriotism has been founded. Kagawa began one of his books with the words, 'Can anything save Japan?' After reading this book one is inclined to answer:

> 'Nothing but a complete defeat by China to destroy once for all the blasphemous pretensions of the Imperial throne, as nothing can save Germany but the complete destruction of Nazism.'

The book before us reveals Japan as a worthy member of the Axis alliance, an example equal to Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy of the sort of nationalism which a humane world cannot tolerate, because it recognises no spiritual or moral curb to its urge for selfish domination over other races. When the arrogance of totalitarianism has brought about its own destruction in Germany, Italy and Japan, and left them as memories more hateful than those of the Empires of Babylon and Baghdad, the simple, kindly relations existing between the various races of Fiji will remain as a model for the construction of a peaceful world in which the races of mankind can live together in harmony. And those ideal racial relations will depend, as they always have done, on individuals like Jeremiah who are free from selfish interests and are moved only by devotion to God and His righteousness.

L. E. Browne.

LAW AND LOVE*

This book, of modest dimensions, is a fresh and incisive study of the ethical teaching of Jesus. It will be a helpful guide to many Christians to-day who are perplexed by the tensions between the ideal and the actual.

Professor Jessop starts from the point that there is something deeply wrong with our way of conceiving the moral life. He doubts whether the ethic of Christians is really the Christian ethic.

> 'In Britain, at least, there are two approved conceptions of goodness: on the one hand, the moral life is set forth as unfaltering devotion to duty, as the subjugation of desire to will, of impulse to precept, of conduct to law; on the other hand, the moral life is equated with the requisites of the social order of the day and the respectabilities that grow round them.'

* *Law and Love: A Study of the Christian Ethic*, by T. E. Jessop, Ferens Professor of Philosophy and Psychology in the University College of Hull. (S.C.M. Press. 6/- net. 1940.)

The rut into which institutional Christianity has fallen is, he holds, the morality of duty. The Christian ethic is the ethic of love. Duty is good, but not good enough. It is on the plane of law, and is, therefore, not personal enough. Love both safeguards and enhances individuality. It works by tact instead of by rule, and makes possible a developing, and not a static, ethic. Our need is to see Jesus as He was, so that we may know what goodness and badness really are. Then we shall attain to the love that is generous, positive, childlike, stern, and objective.

Many problems of conduct are thus raised. One is 'pacifism,' and Professor Jessop writes with commendable frankness on this issue:

> 'I am bound to look askance at the pacifist's "War is *always* wrong." This is one of those absolute, utterly general rules which belong to the ethic of duty. It settles a big problem once for all, in advance of all future experience: when new and unpredictable conjunctions of circumstance arise, there is no need, apparently, to examine them at first hand to see what moral task they require. For all time the matter is settled by law. This is a simplification which I cannot accept.'

This little book will be useful as a corrective, not only — as it seems to me — to the 'morality of duty,' but to the morality of sentimentality which many Christians have mistaken for the 'morality of love.' If I do not share the view of Professor Jessop that 'the morality of duty and the morality of love are *disparate,*' at least there can be little doubt that 'love is the fulfilling of the law.'

C. J. Wright.

A GERMAN APPRECIATION OF WILLIAM LAW*

The author of this finely produced volume, son of a Protestant missionary, was a pupil of Friedrich Heiler, whose great work on *Prayer* is known to many in this country. His treatment of his subject reflects the oecumenical standpoint of his teacher, and he is also much indebted to Evelyn Underhill and Henri Brémond, the historian of French mysticism. He has also made frequent use of Stephen Hobhouse's annotated edition of William Law's mystical writings (published by C. W. Daniel in 1938-9). Dr. Minkner has given us here the first connected attempt to trace the stages of our great English mystic's own experience from the hints given in his highly impersonal writings. Thus he sets out evidence for the definitely mystical character of that experience in the period of the *Serious Call,* before he had read the writings of Jacob Boehme; and he recognizes, as has hardly been done before, the wholesome modifications which he introduced into the doctrines of his German master. Altogether this would be under any circumstances a valuable study, inspired as it is by a generous enthusiasm for the adventurous search of the human soul for God and by a

* *Die Stufenfolge des Mystischen Erlebnisses* [*i.e.* The Stages of Mystical Experience] *bei William Law,* by Konrad Minkner. (München, 1939-40.)

super-denominational spirit that accepts guidance from the mystical writers of all branches of the Church Catholic.

But, in the circumstances of the present time, the book is much more than this. This thesis for a doctorate of philosophy in Marburg University in 1939 is the first introduction of a great Englishman to the Christians of Germany. Published actually after the outbreak of war in the hostile atmosphere of Munich, it is a testimony to the vitality of the German Confessional Church and to the comparative tolerance of the generally all-pervading Nazi censorship towards this class of writing. Its fortunate appearance in this country is due partly to a notice in the little monthly journal of the German Quakers, which, until April last (and probably later), has been allowed to circulate unimpeded quiet but outspoken messages of a mystical and international character; and partly to the enterprise of the London Library in securing a copy of the book, just before the invasion of Holland. This little volume is surely a fact of great significance and hope for the future of European Christianity, when the barriers of shattering war and repression are broken down and we seek for links to reunite us, on a much securer basis, with our German brothers in Christ.

STEPHEN HOBHOUSE.

LITURGICAL REVISION IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY *

It is a fashion among ecclesiastical writers, especially of the Anglo-Catholic school, to speak harshly of the Church life in England in the eighteenth century. Yet the Church life which produced a William Law, a Robert Raikes, John and Charles Wesley, such laymen as Dr. Johnson and Edmund Burke, and such bishops as Butler, Berkeley, Gibson and Wilson was not without merit. The eighteenth century was a period, not of religious sloth or religious indifference, but of religious reaction against the ecclesiastical dogmatism, sectarianism and intolerance of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Scientific discoveries were altering men's views of the Universe and the divine method of its government, and as a consequence the older ways of religious thinking and of religious worship were becoming dissatisfying. A sign of this is seen in the number of attempts which were made in this period to secure a revision of the Book of Common Prayer. Even those who have a tolerable knowledge of English Church History know nothing of these efforts to secure liturgical reform. This is no doubt due to the fact that these attempts proved abortive, and historians are chiefly concerned, unlike the poets, with the causes of that triumph.

The period of these attempts begins where the English eighteenth century may also be said to have begun, with the accession of William III in

* *The Prayer Book Reform Movement in the XVIIIth Century*, by A. Elliott Peaston, M.A., B.Litt. (Oxon.), with an introduction by E. C. Ratcliffe. (Basil Blackwell, Oxford. 7/6. 1940.)

1688. The seventeenth century ended in England with the ejection of the Stuarts, for Mary and Anne were really not Stuarts, but Hydes. In 1689 an ecclesiastical commission was appointed 'to consider a further revision of the Prayer Book.' Its purpose was to conciliate, if possible, the Dissenters, who had been treated with little consideration in the revision of the Prayer Book in 1661. This well-intentioned effort, although it received much support from the Bishops, failed, owing on the one hand, to the fanatical intolerance of the clergy in the Lower Houses of Convocation, and on the other hand, to the fear that if a revision were secured which would conciliate the Dissenters, it would probably greatly increase the forces of the non-jurors who had already withdrawn from the Church in formidable numbers. Hence a policy, which might have practically abolished Dissent in England, failed, and the Prayer Book of 1662 is still our only legal Prayer Book even to-day.

Although officially defeated, private efforts at revision continued to be made. The most notable of these unofficial revisionists was Dr. Samuel Clarke, Rector of St. James, Westminster, a man of such weight and learning that it is asserted that had he been less of a Latitudinarian he would have been consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1713 he made a private MS. revision of the Prayer Book which exercised a great influence on all subsequent attempts in that century.

The next most important figure is John Jones, Vicar of Alconbury, who in 1749 published the *Free and Candid Disquisitions relating to the Church of England, and the Means of advancing Religion therein.*

> 'This book suggested that Convocation should encourage the production of reformed liturgies, failing which, it was asked whether "private persons, without breach of modesty or impeachment of their prudence," might not "humbly propose what they shall think proper, and judge to be useful: and even publish what they shall have drawn up, if they shall have just reason to believe it may be of service to the Public."'

The result of this suggestion was the publication of six liturgies between the years of 1751 and 1768.

In support of this revisional effort William Hopkins, Vicar of Bolney, Sussex, published *An Appeal to the Common Sense of all Christian people, more particularly the members of the Church of England, with regard to an important point of faith and practice imposed upon their consciences by Church authority.*

The notable Francis Blackburne, Archdeacon of Cleveland, and the chief promoter of the Feathers Tavern petition, contributed to the movement by the publication of his book *The Confessional.* His son-in-law, Theophilus Lindsey, Vicar of Catterick, left the Established Church and gathered a Unitarian congregation in Essex Street, London, at whose worship a revised Church of England Prayer Book was in use for many

decades. Lindsey's revised Prayer Book was later in use in the notable King's Chapel in Boston, Mass. Other attempts at revision followed, but the whole movement collapsed with the eclipse of Latitudinarianism brought about by the rise of the Methodist and Evangelical movements.

These efforts at Prayer Book revision were prompted by two ideals which were not harmonious. The first ideal was to provide for the Established Church a Liturgy which would satisfy Dissenters and so win them back to the Establishment. It was thought that the scripturalizing of the Prayer Book would be the best way to do this—in other words, to eliminate from the Prayer Book everything which could not find support in the Scriptures, and by the Scriptures was meant the Old and New Testaments, the Apocrypha being rigidly excluded. The second ideal was Rationalist. This Rationalism stood midway between English Traditional Orthodoxy and Deism. Like most efforts of a mediating kind, it secured little support from either party, although men of great gifts, like the elder Pitt and Edmund Burke, viewed it with favour.

An admirable account—concise, precise, analytical and critical—of these attempts at liturgical revision is given by Mr. A. Elliott Peaston in *The Prayer Book Reform Movement in the Eighteenth Century,* which is commended in an Introduction by the well-known Oxford liturgiologist, E. C. Ratcliffe. H.D.A.M.

THE SOCIAL FUNCTION OF CHRISTIANITY*

A great number of subjects of living interest, wide fields of knowledge, the depths of philosophical and theological speculation, and long vistas of history and pre-history find a place in Dr. James' book, *The Social Function of Religion,* which is packed with information of all kinds from Totemism to Canon Law and Spanish Nationalism. Its purpose is to review the present social and religious situation and to try to trace its origin and development, so as to be able to understand how far the diseases which now assail it are, so to speak, functional or organic and by what treatment health and harmony can be restored.

The situation and problems which the book is designed to meet, and the lines on which it suggests a solution may be found, are best stated in the last chapter. The passage must speak for itself at length, for it is important.

> 'In the past, as it has been our purpose in this volume to demonstrate, religion has been the dynamic and consolidating force of society supplying a system of values reflecting the revelation of the spiritual and moral order upon which a sound social life has been maintained. Some transcendent reference over and above and external to society itself has been necessary to bind together the component members in harmonious and creative relations with each other for

* *The Social Function of Religion,* by E. O. James, D.Litt., Ph.D., F.S.A., Hon. D.D. (St. Andrew's). (University of London Press and Hodder and Stoughton, 7/6). Publication date: August 29th, 1940.

the common good of the whole. Human life finds its meaning and fulfilment in a community of persons in communion with a Supreme Personality, be he totem, divine king, ancestor, theocratic deity or saviour-god, in whom are vested all the sources of the values and sanctions of the group. In the Christian revelation this sacred order has formed its ideal and final expression in a divine fellowship of redeemed humanity bound together in relations of responsibility, mutual service and love towards all mankind as the children of a personal Creator Who is the God and Father of the Redeemer.

'When these religious foundations are removed, society has to supply its own dynamic from within itself in the form of a human Leader to whom it is compelled to give some measure of divine attributes and qualities, and to invent an irrational mythology and a materialistic and secular interpretation of history. To take the place of a beneficent Providence, a real or assumed "enemy," or danger, is essential. These are cohesive forces, with militarism or class-warfare as the creative purpose of the ultimate goal — a super-state or classless order with world-wide dominion. To maintain hope and faith society must be kept in a perpetual state of turmoil, social, economic and political . . . for once let life become normal, stable and free from strife, and the "religious" fervour would wane. Such is the secular substitute for society as a spiritual organism and sacred order.

'How is the Church to meet this new situation? Before anything can be done effectively the philosophical and theological presuppositions must be recognized, and the rightful place and function of religion in the body politic determined. Hence this volume. Christianity has its roots in the past, and it can be no more cut off from its antecedents in antiquity than it can be separated from its own historical foundations. If it is a revelation of history giving a final meaning to history, it is also a product of history — the climax and centre of the historical process. Consequently the part played by religion in society throughout the ages is relevant to the consideration of the function that it can and ought to perform in the present and the future. In the past it has been the unifying and consolidating principle connected fundamentally with faith in Providence and the revelation of a moral and spiritual order' (pp. 298-300).

Dr. James first deals with Providence as the first of the transcendental references which 'throughout the ages have constituted the dynamic and unifying principle of human groups, ancient and modern, primitive and civilized' (p. 4). The first chapter traces the history and significance of the idea of Providence from the dawn of human history, in every type of culture and thought. Its primary importance was due to the fact that Providence was concerned with man's most urgent and natural needs, food supply and survival of the race. Of the tendencies of these latter days the author says:

'From the Renaissance and the Age of Discovery the western world has been engaged in a vast historical experiment with a view to gaining the mastery over the processes of nature and the fortunes of human life. In this gigantic effort the spiritual factors have been largely overlooked, with disastrous results. Instead of becoming master of the world, man is now in danger of becoming the victim

of his own achievements, and the plaything of the forces he has brought into being but failed to control. The time is ripe, therefore, for an enquiry into the integrative function and consolidating force of the spiritual tradition in our culture inherent in the belief in Providence' (pp. 34-5).

Belief in Providence gives rise to the idea of revelation by which man is made acquainted with the will and purposes of the Supernatural for the world and men. Chapter II therefore deals with Myth and Revelation, from the beliefs of primitive man and Andamanese Islanders to the Apocryphal Gospels. There is an examination of Schmidt's theory of primitive 'High Gods.'

Ritual and Worship are the subject of Chapter III:

'As faith is based on revelation made concrete in myth which vouches for the reality of that which is revealed, so myth in its turn is intimately related to ritual, or *dromenon*, as the Greeks would have said . . . Thus, the basic myths are actually the verbal expression of ritual situations upon which the well-being of the community depends. Hence the recurrence of a culture pattern in all the religions of the Ancient East, centring in the things which were done to and by the king in order to secure the continuance of the beneficence of Providence' (p. 80).

At the next stage:

'Belief in a beneficent Providence carries with it not only the sense of dependence on a supernatural order, but also the dependence of man on the society of which he is an integral unit, because all the members of a community share the same common life-principle' (p. 121).

This naturally leads to an examination of Ethics and Conduct in relation to various religions and periods of culture to illustrate their connexion with Providence and the common weal.

Having examined these theological and ethical foundations of society, Dr. James proceeds to the social structure raised upon them as the unifying principles and cohesive force of society. Their importance is such that

'When a living faith in the ultimate meanings of life breaks down, the body politic losses its cohesion and the process of disintegration inevitably follows as in the Roman world in the period of its decline' (p. 159).

This is borne out by a thorough and comparative study of Marriage and the Family, the Church and Community, and the Nation and Nationalism. In this last chapter the examination of the origins, growth and significance of the Neo-Nationalist, Communist and Totalitarian States is just and sane, and in part based on personal experience. The survey of the situation in Turkey and Spain, where religions and ecclesiastical concepts and interests had particular weight and influence, divisive and cohesive respectively, is especially interesting.

The problem of the summarising last chapter is as follows:

> 'In the past . . . the dynamic of all sound social life has always been a vigorous faith in the beneficent workings of a benign Providence. Is this to continue to be the centre and core of society, or is it to be abandoned in favour of one or other of the political and economic movements which are striving for the mastery, or of some new form of secular Humanism, Pragmatism and Logical Positivism?' (p. 271).

Dr. James urges first that

> 'if disintegration is to be avoided solidarity of thought as well as of action must be preserved at all costs. This is indispensable for the maintenance of ethical conduct, since only when every member of a group knows what society requires of him and fashions his life accordingly, is a universal standard possible' (p. 272).

Secondly, since 'nothing can hope to survive permanently the truth of which is incapable of sound defence,'

> 'if Christianity is to maintain its claims to be the final revelation of God to man it must be able to show that its fundamental doctrines are illuminated by rather than in conflict with new knowledge as it accumulates' (p. 280).

Thirdly, there must be a true view of history and progress.

> 'Life, human and physical, pursues the even tenor of its ways till something happens in the course of events to produce a significant change; then an "emergence" occurs, bringing into play new creative powers. Progressive development is not a uniform continuous upward march towards a goal. There are always phases of retrogression on the one hand, and mutations, or "lifts," conditioned by external factors, on the other' (p. 290).

> 'Only by the acceptance of the historical realities can the Faith be established in any age' (p. 296).

Finally, in a more practical vein, Dr. James pleads for a more thorough, wide and expert study of religion, especially in its cultural and philosophical aspects, in schools and universities with all the aids of modern knowledge now available.

> 'Religion like science must be regarded as an essential element in modern education and general culture, rather than the special preserve of ordination candidates and prospective ministers of a specific denomination' (p. 306). More important still, 'If it is to fulfil its proper function in society it must be apprehended by individuals in the totality of their being, intellectually, volitionally and emotionally, so that it becomes the directive force of their lives' (p. 306).

Two last quotations will give us the sum of the matter:

> 'Christianity can never fulfil its proper function till it becomes the integrative and directive force in human life shaping history in accordance with divine purpose, as when the Gospel was first proclaimed in a civilization that had lost direction and nerve' (p. 303). 'It was out of a crisis, first in Judaism and later in the Roman Empire, that Christianity emerged and gave a new direction to history. This

was accomplished not by the inception of schemes of social reform and political ideologies, but by the gradual permeation of society by men and women whose lives were "hid with Christ in God"' (pp. 306-7).

The book is clearly and simply written without too much technical language, and at the end of each chapter is an excellent and exhaustive bibliography of the best authors and sources. Besides being most attractive and instructive for the general reader, the book would make an excellent theme for a study-circle, whether clerical or lay.

W. RICHARDSON.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

SIR,

THE 'NEW ECUMENICAL CREED.'

In the June number of the *Modern Churchman* Arbp. Temple attributes 'the New Ecumenical Creed' to the World Y.M.C.A. My recollection was that it originated with Bp. Wm. T. Manning when he was Rector of Trinity Church, New York. I wrote to him and enclose herewith his reply.

JOHN HOWARD MELISH.

Church of the Holy Trinity,
157 Montague Street, Brooklyn, New York.
May 16th, 1940.

DEAR DR. MELISH,

I have your letter and it is a pleasure to hear from you. The phrase to which you refer was suggested by me, but it was unanimously adopted by our Preliminary Committee which presented the matter to our Convention in Cincinnati, and by our own Commission, and by the other Commissions, and has been adhered to in all the action and all the literature of the Faith and Order Movement. With warm regard,

Faithfully yours,

WILLIAM T. MANNING
(signed for the Bishop in his absence from the city).

Diocese of New York,
Office of the Bishop, The Synod House,
Cathedral Heights, New York City.
July 29th, 1940.

[We apologise to Dr. Melish for delay in publishing the above correspondence, due to an oversight.—ED., *M.C.*]

SIR,

SONGS OF PRAISE.

I was interested in your remarks concerning that excellent hymn-book, *Songs of Praise*, and the excision of verses containing 'discarded' theological views. An example of this is the omission, in the hymn 'All things bright and beautiful,' of the verse:

'The rich man in his castle,
The poor man at his gate,
God made them, high and lowly,
And ordered their estate.'

It is easy, of course, to see why the late Dr. Dearmer should disapprove of this verse, yet it is not so easy to see what is wrong with it from the theological standpoint, particularly so since the refrain of the hymn insists that God made 'all creatures great and small,' including the cuckoo—with its (to us) distressing youthful habit of slaying its host's offspring—and the rat, and the typhoid bacillus.

I write this not in any spirit of cynicism, but simply to point out the incongruities which arise when we attempt to limit God's causation to such objects as claim our personal approval. In other words, if God is responsible for the cuckoo, or the tsetse-fly, why not for the unequal distribution of wealth? The only answer, to my mind, is to enlarge to infinity, and not restrict, God's sphere of causation; to believe in God as the cause not only of 'things bright and beautiful,' but also of things dark and ugly, *and of man's eternal struggle with such things*. In this view there is nothing we can point to as untrue in the verse above. It is unsatisfactory, not because we reject the belief that God did 'order our estate,' but because it omits to mention that God likewise orders our 'state of mind,' which may be one of dissatisfaction with the unequal distribution of wealth and opportunity. A somewhat light-hearted revision of the offending verse has occurred to me:

'The rich man and the poor man
God made them, high and low,
But made the latter anxious
To change the *status quo*.'

E. V. MILNER.

The School House, Brayton, nr. Selby.

SIR,

MR. HARDWICK AND FREEDOM.

With regard to my question, 'Who wants to be free?' to which Mr. E. V. Milner takes exception, the idea I had in mind was that the highest type of life is to be found in losing the self, *i.e.* in absorption in something else. But the individual who is thus 'absorbed' is no longer free, but carried along by a power greater than his own. I am tempted to believe that most of our modern neuroses spring from the fact that we refuse to be carried and insist upon carrying ourselves. This desire for 'freedom and independence' places altogether too great a strain upon the normal man, and the result is either that he becomes a neurotic, or that he hands himself over body and soul to a 'leader' who will take full responsibility for him. It may be that dictatorships are the natural consequence of man's frantic efforts, doomed to failure, to be 'free.'

I think that a great deal of clap-trap has been written and spoken about freedom, a topic which lends itself to rhetorical treatment. We speak of 'freedom of thought,' but does this mean that I am at liberty to believe what I like, *e.g.* that two and two make five, or that fire does not burn? We are tied hand and foot to facts, and if we cut loose we only destroy ourselves.

With regard to Mohammed, Calvin and Marx, they were all 'absorbed' in something bigger than themselves, which is what gave them their tremendous drive. No 'free and independent' individuals, however 'progressive' and intelligent, could achieve what they achieved.

The Book of Common Prayer identifies 'perfect freedom' with 'service.' Unfortunately the word 'service' is to-day a little cheapened. It makes us think of garages, luncheon clubs, etc. But it really means slavery or what I call 'absorption.'

J. C. HARDWICK.